

Appl. No. 10/665,949  
Atty. Docket No. 9365Q  
Response dated October 31, 2007  
In response to Office Action of August 15, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 31 2007

### REMARKS

#### Claim Status

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8-14 were pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8-14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103. With this response, claims 1 and 2 are amended, new claims 22-26 are added, and no claims are withdrawn or canceled.

#### Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 Over Roe, Sabee, Frick

Claims 1, 2 and 8-14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roe, et al. (US 5,776,121) in view of Sabee (US 4,968,313) and Frick (US 4,397,704). The Applicant does not admit that any characterization by the Office Action regarding these rejections is correct, but discusses such characterizations herein for the sake of argument. The Applicant traverses the rejections of these pending claims under 35 USC § 103 over the Roe, Sabee, and Frick references for the reasons discussed below.

Independent claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part a "method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article," including "incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article." From the Applicant's review, neither the Roe reference nor the Sabee reference nor the Frick reference, either independently or in combination, appear to disclose a method which forms an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of an absorbent article, as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. Accordingly, this element of the Applicant's independent claim 1 is outside of the scope and content of the cited prior art. Therefore, incrementally stretching to form the activated portion as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1, differs from the cited prior art and would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the Applicant's invention. For this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this 103(a) rejection for independent claim 1 and for claims 2 and 8-14, which depend therefrom.

#### Rejection Under 35 USC § 103 Over Roe, Sabee, Frick, Anderson

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roe, et al. (US 5,776,121), Sabee (US 4,968,313), and Frick (US 4,397,704), in further view of Anderson, et al. (US 6,605,172). The Applicant does not admit that any characterization

Appl. No. 10/665,949  
Atty. Docket No. 9365Q  
Response dated October 31, 2007  
In response to Office Action of August 15, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

by the Office Action regarding these rejections is correct, but discusses such characterizations herein for the sake of argument. The Applicant traverses the rejections of this pending claim under 35 USC § 103 over the Roe, Sabee, Frick, and Anderson references for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1. Claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part a "method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article," including "incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article." As described above, neither the Roe reference nor the Sabee reference nor the Frick reference, either independently or in combination, appear to disclose incrementally stretching to form the activated portion as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. The Anderson reference does not appear to cure this deficiency. Specifically, the Anderson reference, independently or in combination with the other cited references, does not appear to disclose "incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article" as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. For this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection for claim 4, which depends from claim 1.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103 Over Roe, Sabee, Frick, Anderson, Joest, Melius

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roe, et al. (US 5,776,121), Sabee (US 4,968,313), Frick (US 4,397,704), Anderson, et al. (US 6,605,172), and further in view of Joest, et al. (US 5,830,821) and Melius (US 2004/044322A1). The Applicant does not admit that any characterization by the Office Action regarding these rejections is correct, but discusses such characterizations herein for the sake of argument. The Applicant traverses the rejections of this pending claim under 35 USC § 103 over the Roe, Sabee, Frick, Anderson, Joest, and Melius references for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. Claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part a "method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article," including "incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article." As described above, neither the Roe reference nor the Sabee reference nor

Appl. No. 10/665,949  
Atty. Docket No. 9365Q  
Response dated October 31, 2007  
In response to Office Action of August 15, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

the Frick reference nor the Anderson reference, either independently or in combination, appear to disclose incrementally stretching to form the activated portion as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. The Joest and Melius references does not appear to cure this deficiency. Specifically, the Joest reference and the Melius reference, either independently or in combination with the other cited references, do not appear to disclose "incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article" as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. For this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection for claim 5, which depends from claim 1.

#### Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 Over Klemp, Sabee, Frick

Claims 1, 2 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klemp (US 5,536,350) in view of Sabee (US 4,968,313) and Frick (US 4,397,704). The Applicant does not admit that any characterization by the Office Action regarding these rejections is correct, but discusses such characterizations herein for the sake of argument. The Applicant traverses the rejections of these pending claims under 35 USC § 103 over the Klemp, Sabee, and Frick references for the reasons discussed below.

Independent claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part a "method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article," including "incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article." From the Applicant's review, neither the Klemp reference nor the Sabee reference nor the Frick reference, either independently or in combination, appear to disclose a method which forms an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of an absorbent article, as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. Accordingly, this element of the Applicant's independent claim 1 is outside of the scope and content of the cited prior art. Therefore, incrementally stretching to form the activated portion as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1, differs from the cited prior art and would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the Applicant's invention. For this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this 103(a) rejection for independent claim 1 and for claims 2 and 8-14, which depend therefrom.

#### Rejection Under 35 USC § 103 Over Klemp, Sabee, Frick, Anderson

Page 8 of 11

Appl. No. 10/665,949  
Atty. Docket No. 9365Q  
Response dated October 31, 2007  
In response to Office Action of August 15, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klemp (US 5,536,350), Sabee (US 4,968,313), and Frick (US 4,397,704), in further view of Anderson, et al. (US 6,605,172). The Applicant does not admit that any characterization by the Office Action regarding these rejections is correct, but discusses such characterizations herein for the sake of argument. The Applicant traverses the rejections of this pending claim under 35 USC § 103 over the Klemp, Sabee, Frick, and Anderson references for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1. Claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part a “method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article,” including “incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article.” As described above, neither the Klemp reference nor the Sabee reference nor the Frick reference, either independently or in combination, appear to disclose incrementally stretching to form the activated portion as recited in part in the Applicant’s independent claim 1. The Anderson reference does not appear to cure this deficiency. Specifically, the Anderson reference, independently or in combination with the other cited references, does not appear to disclose “incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article” as recited in part in the Applicant’s independent claim 1. For this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection for claim 4, which depends from claim 1.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103 Over Klemp, Sabee, Frick, Anderson, Joest, Melius

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klemp (US 5,536,350), Sabee (US 4,968,313), Frick (US 4,397,704), Anderson, et al. (US 6,605,172), and further in view of Joest, et al. (US 5,830,821) and Melius (US 2004/044322A1). The Applicant does not admit that any characterization by the Office Action regarding these rejections is correct, but discusses such characterizations herein for the sake of argument. The Applicant traverses the rejections of this pending claim under 35 USC § 103 over the Klemp, Sabee, Frick, Anderson, Joest, and Melius references for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. Claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part a “method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article,” including

Appl. No. 10/665,949  
Atty. Docket No. 9365Q  
Response dated October 31, 2007  
In response to Office Action of August 15, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

"incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article." As described above, neither the Klemp reference nor the Sabee reference nor the Frick reference nor the Anderson reference, either independently or in combination, appear to disclose incrementally stretching to form the activated portion as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. The Joest and Melius references does not appear to cure this deficiency. Specifically, the Joest reference and the Melius reference, either independently or in combination with the other cited references, do not appear to disclose "incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article along a longitudinal edge to form an activated portion disposed laterally inboard to and offset from a longitudinal edge of the article" as recited in part in the Applicant's independent claim 1. For this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection for claim 5, which depends from claim 1.

#### Support for New Claims

New claim 22 recites in part "a method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article comprising...incrementally stretching a portion of the absorbent article to form an activated portion, wherein an overall shape of the activated portion is substantially arched." The Applicant points out that support for new claim 22, as well as for claims 23 and 24, which depend therefrom, can be found at least on page 13, first paragraph and in Figures 5a and 6a.

New claim 25 recites in part "a method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article comprising" a step of folding "while the longitudinal edge is uncut." The Applicant points out that support for new claim 25, can be found at least on page 14, under the subsection "Cutting."

New claim 26 recites in part "a method for making an edge fold on an absorbent article comprising...folding at least a portion of the activated portion to form a folded portion with substantially curved shape and a folded portion length." The Applicant points out that support for new claim 26, can be found at least on page 15, first paragraph and in Figures 5c and 6c.

Based on the above, the Applicant submits that new claims 22-26 are supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed and thus, are proper. The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the new claims 22-26.

Appl. No. 10/665,949  
Atty. Docket No. 9365Q  
Response dated October 31, 2007  
In response to Office Action of August 15, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 31 2007

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the cited references. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 

Date: October 31, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

Charles R. Ware  
Registration No. 54,881  
(513) 634-5042